

REMARKS

I. Disposition of the Claims

A detailed listing of all claims that are or were in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented with an appropriate status identifier.

Claims 73-86 are pending. Claim 73 is currently amended. Claim 74 is canceled. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 73, 75-86 will be pending.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejections

The Office rejected claims 73-86 for allegedly failing to comply with the written description and enablement requirements.

With respect to the assertion that the claims encompass “all and every neurological disorder”, the Examiner will see that claim 73 has been amended accordingly.

The written description and enablement rejection hinges on the following. First, the Examiner’s points to the results of the MPTP model as being “inconclusive” because of the data presented for compounds L and M in Table V. Second, the Examiner asserts that the compounds of the invention will not cross the blood-brain barrier because of their structure, thus must be administered intracranially, a mode of administration that the Examiner describes as being complex and a potential cause of brain damage. Third, the Examiner asserts that the specification exclusively provides a “description limited to topical composition” (Office Action, pages 3-4).

The Applicants draw the Examiner's attention to Table IV (listing compounds) on page 43 and Table V (listing corresponding test data) on page 47 of the specification. Table V presents data showing that compounds that fall within the scope of instant formula (I) and other compounds that are similarly substituted with a carboxylic acid or carboxylic acid isostere group are efficacious in neuronal regeneration after induction of MPTP-derived lesions. The Examiner will also note that the compounds are administered systemically, (page 46, lines 5-7).

The instant claims are drawn to methods of treating a neurological disorder, specifically peripheral neuropathies, without any limitations on the theory of the mechanism of action of the claimed compounds. The Applicants do not wish to speculate about the mechanism of action or the ease at which the compounds shown in Table IV and V cross the blood-brain barrier. It is clear from the data shown, however, that compound within the scope of formula I and similarly substituted compounds are effective in neuronal regeneration with activities ranging from 14% to 46.5% recovery.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a

check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 27-June-2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 29728
Telephone: (202) 295-4059
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 

Rouget F. Henschel
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,221